

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/652,003	08/31/2000	Graham Kirsch	M4065.0340/P340	2935	
24998	7590 10/31/2003		EXAMINER		
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN & OSHINSKY LLP 2101 L STREET NW			CHOI, WOO H		
	WASHINGTON, DC 20037-1526		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	,		2186	11/	
	•		DATE MAILED: 10/31/2003	, 17	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	al-		
Advisory Action	09/652,003	KIRSCH, GRAHAM	,•		
navioury notion	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Woo H. Choi	2186			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress		
THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.) a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply h places the applica	ation in		
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]				
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing SFILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	g date of the final rejecti HE FINAL REJECTION.	on. See MPEP		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offictimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	of extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the mai	unt of the fee. The apportion of the feet in the final	ropriate extension Office action; or		
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF					
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:				
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);			
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);				
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or sir	mplifying the		
(d) they present additional claims without canceli NOTE:	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claim	s.		
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):				
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) 7-10,14-17,19 timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowab		owable if submitted	in a separate,		
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NO	T place the		
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were	e newly		
7.⊠ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			and an		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
Claim(s) allowed: <u>19-21</u> .					
Claim(s) objected to: 7-10,14-17,28-31 and 36-39.					
Claim(s) rejected: 1-6,11-13,22-27,32-35,41-49 and 5	<u>51</u> .				
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 18,42,50.					
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) approved or b) disapp	roved by the Exami	ner.		
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)				
10. Other:					
					



Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments are not persuasive. Applicant's argument that there is no data path circuit between a PE and a memory is absurd. A functional computer's processor requires a data path that connects it to memory for storage and retrieval of data/instruction to be processed. Applicant's argument against the Fung reference has been addressed in the last office action.

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100